APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,916	01/09/2002	Rajesh V. Patil	LOT920010028US1	3114

7590   03/09/2005

Shelley M. Beckstrand
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827-1616

EXAMINER
PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>10/045,916</td><td>PATIL, RAJESH V.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Ryan F Pitaro</td><td>2174</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2001</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01092002</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-22 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 7,19 recite the limitation "said current view" in line2 of claims 7 and 19.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4.   Claims 9,21 recite the limitation "said hide-when flag" in line 4 of claims 9 and 21.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7.   Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7.   Claims 1-7,10-19,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable

by DeJean ("DeJean", Revealing the Hidden Secrets of "hide-when").

As per independent claim 1, DeJean discloses a method for displaying actions

with respect document: which may be executed comprising the steps of: defining for a

view a plurality of actions, each said action characterized as static or dynamic, with

each said dynamic action characterized by respective hide-when criteria (page 1 lines

31-35); responsive to user selection of a next document characterized as to be

evaluated, for each said dynamic action evaluating said hide-when criteria (Page 6 lines

1-2 Figure 6.2); and responsive to said hide-when criteria selectively showing or hiding

a corresponding action (Page 6 lines 3-7, Page 7 lines 1-4).

As per independent claim 2, DeJean discloses a method for presenting actions

which may be performed with respect to a document, comprising the steps of:

responsive to user selection of a next document, evaluating prospective actions as

static or dynamic (Page 6 lines 1-2); for dynamic actions, evaluating hide-when criteria

returning true when said dynamic action is to be hidden for said next document (Page 2

lines 26-30); and displaying in an action list those prospective actions for which said

hide-when criteria evaluated true (Page 1 lines 31-33; Only those true to hide-when formula and static will appear in the UI).

As per independent claim 3, DeJean discloses a method for displaying actions appropriate with respect to successive documents, comprising the steps of: during action creation, defining for each dynamic action (Page 1 lines 31-33); a hide-when formula during view creation, defining a plurality of actions applicable to said view and, responsive to at least one said action being a dynamic action, characterizing said view as to be evaluated (Page 6 lines 3-7, page 7 lines 1-4); and responsive to user selection of a next document for presentation in said view, which next document characterized as to be evaluated, selectively hiding or showing each said action applicable to said view (Page 7 lines 1-7).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, DeJean discloses a method further comprising the step of, during action creation, providing for each action a record including text attributes (Figure 2.1(a)), action button (Figure 4.2), and a hide-when formula (Figure 1).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, DeJean discloses a method further comprising the step of setting said hide-when formula to null for static actions comprising the step defining said hide-when formula for dynamic actions by reference to a current document parameter or field (Page 2 lines 1-3; wherein a formula will never yield true if NULL is the formula; therefore, actions will not be hidden).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, DeJean discloses a method further comprising the step of defining said hide-when formula for dynamic actions by reference to a current document parameter or field (Page 5 lines 2-6).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, DeJean discloses a method further comprising the step of displaying all actions applicable to said current view responsive to said current view being characterized as not to be evaluated (Page 6 lines 1-2).

As per independent claim 10, DeJean discloses a system for presenting actions which may be executed with respect document a view, comprising: for each prospective action, an action record including hide-when evaluation indicia (Page 1 lines 31-33); and for each prospective view, a view record including an action selection list and an action to be evaluated flag, said action to be evaluated flag being set to true if at least one action in said action selection list is a dynamic action (Page 6 lines 1-7; will check to see if hid-when criteria is applicable).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, DeJean discloses said document including a data fields and said hide-when evaluation indicia referencing said data field (Figure 3.3).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, DeJean discloses a display for presenting to a user in a view panel a current document and an action list dynamically configured to hide prospective actions for which said hide-when evaluation indicia evaluates to hide (Page 6 lines 3-7, Page 7 lines 1-4).

Claim 13 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to that of claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rational.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to that of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claim 8,9,20,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

DeJean ("DeJean", Revealing the Hidden Secrets of "hide-when") in view of Sams'

Teach Yourself Lotus Notes 4.6 in 24 hours ("Sams", Sams' Teach Yourself Lotus

Notes 4.6 in 24 hours).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 4, DeJean fails to distinctly point out

defining view indicia. However, Sams teaches defining for each said view a view record

including document filter (Page 67 lines 16-18), formatting specification (Page 69 (Just

a minute box)), action selection list (Page 74 Figure 5.11), and an action to be

evaluated flag (Page 68 Figure 5.6, marker). Therefore it would have been obvious to

an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of DeJean with the current

teaching of Sams. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a quick and useful

way of scanning documents.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, DeJean-Sams discloses a

method setting an action to be evaluated flag to true for each view including a dynamic

action (Page 6 Figure 6.2 lines 1-2) displaying those actions for which said hide-when

flag evaluates false and either said action has no hide-when formula or said hide-when

formula evaluates true (Page 1 lines 31-34,display static actions or those which

evaluate true).

Claim 20 is similar in scope to that of claim 8, and is therefore rejected under

similar rational.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under

similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100